

Letter to Editor

Correspondence to “Clinicopathological characteristics and survival outcomes of patients with coexistence of adenomyosis and endometrial carcinoma”

Lv Bin, Zeng Xi

Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, The West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, Key Laboratory of Birth Defects and Related Diseases of Women and Children (Sichuan University), Ministry of Education, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan Province, China

Received April 5, 2018; Accepted May 17, 2018; Epub July 1, 2018; Published July 15, 2018

We are responding to the article by Zhengmao Zhang et al. on “Clinicopathological characteristics and survival outcomes of patients with coexistence of adenomyosis and endometrial carcinoma” (Volume 11, Number 2: 956-962; 2018) [1], which addressed research on survival in adenomyosis and endometrial carcinoma patients.

The association between adenomyosis and endometrial carcinoma is a heated research topic. The present research is thought-provoking, providing new ideas about adenomyosis and endometrial carcinoma. However, we consider some of their statistical analysis not rigorous enough.

First, the statistics that analyze the method of the adnexectomy group in [Table S1](#) is wrong. Based on the percentages of the four parts, there was only one patient who had adenomyosis and was without adnexectomy. Fisher's Exact Test should be suitable instead of Chi-square Test ($\chi^2=0.018$ and $P=0.893$ are the values of the Chi-square Test). Also, the “199.23%” should be “99.23%”.

Second, in the *BMI* analysis in **Table 1**, the sum of the detailed number was 1576, not equal to the total of 1584 they claimed. This situation also appeared in **Table 2** of the groups of *adnexa invasion*, *pelvic LN metastasis*, and *aortic LN metastasis*.

Third, the authors claimed a majority of the patients (>90%) in this study had endometrioid histology; how do the authors guarantee the pathologic types of the rest? In the immunohistochemical staining, did they use the same block of tissue specimen sections for single-labelled stains with each type of marker? If not, how do they exclude bias among the sections?

Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Zeng Xi, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, The West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, No. 20 Section Three, Renmin South Road, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan Province, China. Tel: 86-183283-70076; E-mail: Zengxi1003@hotmail.com

References

- [1] Zhang ZhM, Yang BT, Zhang WZ, et al. Clinicopathological characteristics and survival outcomes of patients with coexistence of adenomyosis and endometrial carcinoma. *Int J Clin Exp Pathol* 2018; 11: 956-962.

A letter of statistics analysis modification viewpoints

Table 1. Associations of clinical characteristics with the incidence of adenomyosis co-existence in patients with endometrial carcinoma Total With Adenomyosis Without Adenomyosis (Cited from the original article)

	Total	With Adenomyosis	Without Adenomyosis	χ^2	P
Menopausal Status					
Premenopausal	573	69 (46%)	504 (35.15%)	6.928	0.008
Postmenopausal	1011	81 (54%)	930 (64.86%)		
Age, years					
Median	55	53	55	12.363	<0.001
< 55	745	91 (60.67%)	654 (41.92%)		
≥ 55	839	59 (39.33%)	780 (58.08%)		
BMI					
Median	26.07	27	26.65	0.511	0.475
< 25	488	42 (28.38%)	446 (31.23%)		
≥ 25	1088	106 (71.62%)	982 (68.77%)		

Table 2. Association of histopathological characteristics with the incidence of adenomyosis co-existence in patients with endometrial carcinoma (Cited from the original article)

	With Adenomyosis N=150	Without Adenomyosis N=1434	χ^2	P
Histology				
Endometrioid cancer	140 (93.33%)	1294 (90.23%)	1.519	0.218
Non-endometrioid cancer	10 (6.67%)	140 (9.76%)		
Stage				
I-II	139 (92.67%)	1227 (85.56%)	5.771	0.016
III-IV	11 (7.33%)	207 (14.44%)		
Grade				
1-2	137 (91.33%)	1212 (84.52%)	4.991	0.025
3	13 (8.67%)	222 (15.48%)		
Myometrial invasion				
< 1/2	135 (90%)	1115 (77.75%)	12.237	< 0.001
≥ 1/2	15 (10%)	319 (22.25%)		
LVI				
No	144 (96%)	1341 (93.51%)	1.513	0.219
Yes	6 (4%)	93 (6.49%)		
Cervical invasion				
No	124 (82.67%)	1105 (77.06%)	2.457	0.117
Yes	26 (17.33%)	329 (22.94%)		
Adnexa invasion				
No	144 (96.64%)	1330 (93.46%)	2.333	0.127
Yes	5 (3.36%)	93 (6.54%)		
Pelvic LN metastasis				
No	131 (97.04%)	1176 (92.09%)	4.339	0.037
Yes	4 (2.96%)	101 (7.91%)		
Aortic LN metastasis				
No	96 (100%)	767 (95.64%)	--	--
Yes	0	35 (4.36%)		

A letter of statistics analysis modification viewpoints

Table S1. The characteristics of the surgical procedures (Cited from the original article)

	Total N=1584	With Adenomyosis N=150	Without Adenomyosis N=1434	χ^2	<i>P</i>
Hysterectomy type					
Adbominal/vaginal	56.50%	45.33%	57.67%	0.501	0.479
Laparoscopic	43.5%	54.67%	42.33%		
Hysterectomy					
Radical Hysterectomy	2.53%	1.33%	2.65%	5.433	0.066
Modified radical hysterectomy	7.64%	3.33%	8.09%		
Adnexectomy					
Yes	99.24%	99.33%	199.23%	0.018	0.893
No	0.76%	0.67%	0.77%		
Pelvic lymph node excision					
Yes	89.14%	90%	89.05%	0.126	0.722
No	10.86%	10%	10.95%		
Aortic lymph node excision					
Yes	56.76%	64%	55.93%	3.604	0.058
No	43.24%	36%	44.07%		
Number of LN					
Median	20	20	20		0.514